UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,353	01/19/2001	Yasuo Sugahara	1046.1233/JDH	7137

21171   7590   04/21/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	5

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 October 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3,4_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) .
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 24 are presented for examination.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: spelling of

"form" on line 4, page 8 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

        A.   The following terms lack antecedent basis:

                I.   An automatic display   -   Claims 2-8, 10-16 and

18-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Glommen et al. [US Patent No 6,393,479], in view of Freivald et al. [US Patent No

6,219,818].

7.   As per claim 1, Glommen discloses the invention substantially as claimed

including an automatic display method for update information comprising the steps of:

        receiving an information transmission request including an address and terminal

update information from a client terminal [702, Figure 7; and col 7, lines 64-col 8, lines

14];

        adding a display attribute to the extracted individual information [i.e. image

source file] [col 7, lines 2-6; and col 8, lines 44-48];

        and editing the individual information to which a display attribute is added and

returning the edited individual information to said client terminal as document

information for display [608, Figure 6; and col 9, lines 6-13].

        Glommen does not specifically disclose

        reading out server side document information including individual update

information for each piece of individual information;

extracting individual information that is updated after said terminal update

information by comparing said terminal update information and said individual update

information;

Freivald discloses

reading out server side document information including individual update

information for each piece of individual information [col 4, lines 5-8 and lines 17-19;

and col 15, lines 66-col 16, lines 5];

extracting individual information that is updated after said terminal update

information by comparing said terminal update information and said individual update

information [col 4, lines 53-col 5, lines 6];

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Glommen and Freivald because Freivald's

teaching of comparison would allow to keep data integrity by providing most up to date

information.

8.   As per claim 2, Glommen discloses wherein said step of extracting said individual

information comprises the steps of:

analyzing whether or not a tag in the server side document information is an

update tag having an update attribute [706, 708, Figure 7];

reading out, if the tag is an update tag, update date and time or update date

included in the update tag as individual update information [col 10, lines 23-26];

comparing said update date and time or said update date with a last access date

and time or a last access date with respect to said server side document information for

each terminal included in said terminal update information [col 8, lines 49-65]; and

extracting, as a result of said comparison, update information that is updated after

the last access date and time or the last access date with respect to said server side

document information [col 10, lines 1-12].

Glommen does not specifically disclose

reading out the server side document information.

Freivald discloses

reading out the server side document information [col 4, lines 5-8 and lines 17-

19; and col 15, lines 66-col 16, lines 5].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Glommen and Freivald because Freivald's

teaching would allow to supply to users with updated valuable information in an

efficient manner.

9.   As per claim 3, Glommen discloses wherein the editing of said individual

information is processing for deleting an update tag having an update attribute added to

the server side document information, and adding a general-purpose displaying tag or

displaying figure that is readable by the client terminal [col 9, lines 10-12; and col 14,

lines 32-38].

10.   As per claim 4, Glommen discloses wherein, if the terminal update information

does not exist in said information transmission request, only deletion of the update tag

having an update attribute added to said server side document information is performed

when editing said individual information, and the server side document information after

the deletion is returned to said client terminal as document information for display [704,

Figure 7; and col 8, lines 36-48].

11.   As per claim 5, Glommen discloses wherein, if the terminal update information

does not exist in said information transmission request, processing of deleting the update

tag having an update attribute added to the server side document information with

respect to all pieces of individual information when editing said individual information

and adding a general-purpose displaying tag or displaying figure that is readable by the

client terminal is performed [710, Figure 7; and col 9, lines 4-13].

12.   As per claim 6, Glommen does not specifically disclose wherein the comparison

of said terminal update information and said individual update information is performed

by adding a predetermined correction value to either said terminal update information or

said individual update information. Freivald discloses wherein the comparison of said

terminal update information and said individual update information is performed by

adding a predetermined correction value to either said terminal update information or

said individual update information [col 11, lines 1-20]. It would have been obvious to

a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of

Glommen and Freivald because Freivald's teaching would allow to maintain data

consistency in a communication network.

13.   As per claim 7, Glommen does not specifically disclose wherein said

predetermined correction value is the number of days. Freivald discloses wherein said

predetermined correction value is the number of days [col 13, lines 38-40]. It would

have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teaching of Glommen and Freivald because Freivald's teaching would

allow to update information according to the needs of user for improved user's

convenience.

14.   As per claim 8, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2 and 7.

15.   As per claims 9-16, they are apparatus claimed of claims 1-8, they are rejected for

similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-8.

16.   As per claims 17-24, they are program product claimed of claims 1-8, they are

rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-8.

17.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three)**

months and 0 (zero) days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the

period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C

133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-
5321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (8:00 – 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directly to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-
3900.

Dustin Nguyen

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100